DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 397 960 PS 024 333

AUTHOR McNamee, Abigail S.
TITLE Women and War, Children and War: Stretching the Bonds of Caregiving.
PUB DATE [94]
NOTE 55p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Caregiver Child Relationship; *Caregiver Role; Child Development; Children; Emotional Experience; Mass Media Effects; Posttraumatic Stress Disorder; Social Environment; *Stress Variables; *War; World War II
IDENTIFIERS Historical Background; Northern Ireland; Resilience (Personality); Traumas

ABSTRACT

Many things stretch the bonds between caregiver and child, such as war, stress, and trauma. This paper reviews the literature on children who are in direct contact with war or indirect contact with war through television or others' conversations. It also describes the effects of war on children and their families, and children's psychological response. The introduction discusses the effects of war on women and caretaking, how children create for themselves the illusion of safety, and how stress or trauma disrupt those illusions. This section also provides a rationale for the literature review. The next sections review the literature on children as passive victims of war and as active/warrior victims of war. The paper frequently quotes from Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham's "War and Children," a book written on the psychoanalytic understanding of children, and presents a discussion of the authors' viewpoints and the importance of their work. The lives and work histories of Freud and Burlingham are also described. The paper also discusses the work of many other early childhood educators, such as Ernst Papanek's work on children's fears, Mass's work on the psychology of young adults, Heinicke and Westheimer's study on children who are separated from parents, and Morris Fraser's writing on children's response to disaster. The paper's conclusion touches on resilience and the long-term effects of war on children. This section also notes that the point of understanding the works of Freud and Burlingham and others related to child caregiving is to work harder in public life to prevent war and in private life to maintain the illusion of safety. Contains 25 references. (MOK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 397 960

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OUTLINE

Women and War, Children and War: Stretching the Bonds of Caregiving

Dr. Abigail S. McNamee
Lehman College of The City University of New York

Introduction

- Women and Caretaking
- Children and Illusion
- Children and Stress or Trauma
- Limitation of My Work
- Rationale for a Review of Literature

Children as Passive Victims of War

Children as Active/Warrior Victims of War

Conclusion

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Abigail S. McNamee
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

PS 024333

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

WOMEN AND WAR,
CHILDREN AND WAR: STRETCHING THE BONDS OF CAREGIVING

Abigail S. McNamee
Lehman College of The City University of New York

Introduction

Women and Caregiving

War offers a tragic but interesting dilemma for women, perhaps particularly for women; it offers a painful predicament:

- the problem of responding to the paternalism of war if we accept that wars are primarily in the control of men;
- the problem of coping with the stresses of war for those who nurture and those need nurturance;

What are women's choices? Do we support war, this traditional killing game of men, from the edges as we traditionally sending off those whom we care for, including children, as warriors? Do we fight in it? The United States has begun to experience wars (or actions) wherein mothers have gone to fight.

In addition to offering a dilemma, war is a metaphor for the conflict women face as we try to integrate the complexity of our roles for state and family: as we find ways of being nurturers in public life; as we find ways of being nurturers in the family while living a public life; as we find ways of supporting boys and men as nurturers in their public and private life.

All of my professional life has focused, in one way or another, on giving care to children: not only by women but especially by women...women as parents, as teachers, as therapists, as good friends of children. I have been interested in

PS 02433

caregiving when it goes well and children flourish, and in the subtle and terrifying ways it can go badly, and children cease to flourish developing self-defeating ways of surviving psychologically and/or physically.

Many things stretch the bonds between caregiver and child, perhaps none more than war. War, in fact, can rip the bonds apart at worst, or stretch them with little hope of memory yarn to pull them back into comfortable position once again. War destroys the illusion in caregiver and child, vulnerable at the best of times, that we are safe.

Children and Illusion

I think that all of life is an illusion to one degree or another. From the beginning of life, children summarize and generalize their daily experiences, developing impressions of the world. From their impressions of experiences, illusions develop which are both sensual and conceptual in nature, specific and general in form, and to some extent inaccurate. It is out of these illusions that assumptions about ourselves and the world in which we live develop and continue, often throughout life, with little or no reality testing. Our basic assumptions are 1) that the world is a safe place; 2) that I am ok; 3) that I can influence what happens in the world (Janoff-Bulman, 1992). These basic assumptions are important; they allow an illusion of safety, they allow space in which to develop.

Accuracy of illusion and resulting assumption is perhaps not necessary early in life; in fact accuracy may destroy or interfere

with the development of an illusion of safety for a child. But, as we develop, our illusions must be modified somewhat by reality to further our adaptation to life. The earlier illusions are the foundations of our lives; the later developed, more grown-up, illusions are working hypotheses which we can tryout and then retain or discard. But not all of our illusions are perfectly in tune with reality even in adulthood...these illusions provide us with "the means for trusting ourselves and our environment" (Janoff-Bulman, p. 55). We tend toward conservatism...we tend to hold on to our illusions, biasing us toward what we already know, saving us energy. Change takes place slowly.

Children and Stress or Trauma

Despite the development of a protective illusion of safety, children, all children, live their lives experiencing some degree of stress...even relatively happy children. Some stressors are merely difficult life experiences; some are traumatic, violent shocks or wounds with consequences affecting the whole of a person.

Some stressors seem to come primarily from inside the child. These might be related to a child's intelligence, ethnicity or physical appearance, to illness, to fears and wishes, and to mistaken, unhelpful, or self-defeating perceptions of self and others (McNamee & McNamee, 1981, McNamee, 1982).

Other stressors seem to come primarily from outside the child. These might be related to events within the family where safety and security are central issues (absence or death of a parent/s, family discord/ divorce, evacuation and separation of children from parent

for a variety of reasons, physical destruction of the home by natural and unnatural causes). Stressors might also be related to the immediate or larger outside community where safety remains a central issue. Internal and external stressors are always part of children's lives to some extent; unfortunate children experience a stacking of multiple stressors so that they do not have the option of dealing with only one at a time. War intrudes itself on any already existing stressors creating excruciating pressure on the caregiving bonds between parent and child; excruciating pressure on the child's ability to cope and on the parent's ability to protect the child physically and to protect the child's illusion of safety psychologically.

Some stressors, like war, create chaos and threaten our survival and self-preservation and we're not prepared for them, our earlier illusions are shattered. Safety and security cannot be assumed. New illusions which are more responsive to the new devastating reality must be developed if a person is to survive. Denial and numbing allow time for a new integration; intrusive and repetitive re-experiencing of the events, which may seem painful and self-defeating, also allow for a new integration. Language provides a medium for containing, processing, and sharing the events with others as we modify our interpretations of the events and re-define them after the fact. Dreams allow us to play freely with the new material without real world constraints. Self-blame, seemingly negative, allows us to take some bit of power, some sort of control: what could have been done to prevent; what can be done

to change. A warm supportive environment provides powerful evidence that some people are still good, that the world is not all evil and meaningless, that you are a worthy person (Janoff-Bulman, 1992).

Limitations of My Work

My work with children brings together the three foci that I have alluded to: 1) caregiving as it exists in its many forms between caregiver and child, 2) the development of illusions and the impact of stress as it exists in many forms in any child's life, 3) and war, perhaps the ultimate stressor when it penetrates so viciously a child's life. The laboratories for my work have been four: 1) the classroom as a professor of child development, where we all know from personal experience that stressors run rampant; 2) the home as well, where we all know that stressors run no less rampant; 3) the psychotherapy office as a child psychotherapist, where I often hear second-hand what I cannot observe in person; and 4) Northern Ireland, where as a researcher, I have seen the effects of war on children and their caregivers.

I have not myself experienced, where I live, the chaos of war as it exists between countries, or between parts of countries, nor have I experienced the shattering of assumptions which accompany it. I was born during World War II, I was a young girl during the Korean War, a college student during the Vietnam War, an adult during the Gulf War,...all of which the United States was involved in. But my experience was vicarious only. I can present only a psychology related to caretaking during this kind of war. Having

said that, I would like to say that I have experienced smaller wars: the wars evident in cities in the United States, particularly The Bronx, New York, where I work, the wars evident between individual people, between husband and wife, parent and child, friend and friend, colleague and colleague. I have experienced as well the internal wars created by conflicting ideas, desires, the internal war created when a child dies. But these are small wars.

My work in Northern Ireland has not been directly related to the effects of war on children, but rather on the fringes of war. I have been involved in researching the effects of bringing children out of Belfast for summer holiday in an attempt to give them some respite from what is called euphemistically "The Troubles"; I have also been writing about Integrated education, an attempt to bring Protestant and Catholic children together in school settings, very unusual in Northern Ireland where there are two separate school systems (The State system/Protestant and the Maintained system/Catholic) with virtually no cross over though the State/Protestant system claims that it is, of course, allowed.

Rationale for a Review of Literature

Because of my work in Northern Ireland I have become intrigued with the literature on children and war. It is an interesting literature contributed to by individuals from a variety of disciplines: professors, caretakers, clinicians, journalists. It is a literature which spans a wide range of wars and countries. It is, however, a literature which began rather late in history:

there is little or no reference to the effects of war on children prior to World War II; which corresponds to interest in children as objects of study in general. I would like to share a small part of this literature with you with the particular goal of applying it, as women interested in caretaking each other, and as women primarily responsible for the caretaking of children, to our current and future experience with war, which, unfortunately, I expect to always be a devastating part of human experience.

I would like to focus today on literature dealing with those children who are in direct contact with war: reacting as passive victim or as active/warrior victim; both roles ripping at the bonds of caretaking; but there is also literature dealing with those children who are in indirect contact with war (whose parents go away to fight one or who see it on television, hear about it in others' conversation: their fears and fantasies, as even here the caretaking bonds are stretched, perhaps permanently. The point? Ultimately that we'll work harder to prevent wars, an unlikely outcome certainly; and that we'll work harder to maintain the illusion of safety (there being no real safety this is the best we can hope for)...that we'll work harder to maintain the illusion of safety for children wherever we can so that they'll have time to develop an unbruised, undamaged, undefeated, unselfdefeating sense of self. Maurice Sendak, the children's author and illustrator, illustrated this concept of illusory safety by drawing a bird's nest filled with baby birds atop the head of one of his wild creatures, in PEACE, a picture book on peace for children. He

labeled it "A Wild Safe Place". This is what I am after for children, an illusion of safety in a wild world.

War, in whatever form it takes, wherever it takes form, stretches the bonds of caregiving, caregiving between adults, and especially caregiving between adult and child. To understand caretaking during current and, perhaps, future wars, I have chosen to look primarily at the work of two women whose bonds of caregiving strengthened as they lived through World War II. Their own relationship strengthened, despite terrible pressures; the bonds of caretaking between themselves and children and children's families strengthened. In addition, the influence of their work over fifty years has strengthened the bonds of caretaking between adults and children during the most difficult of times. Their influence was made possible because of their intelligence, energy, and sensitivity; but also because of the unique nature of their relationship. I would like to interweave the personal and professional bonding between two women with the fruit of their work: the stretching and strengthening of bonding between child and caregiver during war.

War is dangerous to children in psychological as well as physical ways. There are basically two alternatives for children having direct experience with war: they can become passive victims or active/warrior victims. I think that children construct their own reality within the passive or active victim role, tailoring either alternative to their own uniqueness, reacting individually to their unique context. But I think these two alternatives offer

the only choices in time of war. Both alternatives rip at the bonds of caregiving.

1) When children become passive victims war is done to them, they see themselves as helpless to some degree, they respond with passivity to some degree. Passivity may be a poor choice of vocabulary here: I do not mean that they are intellectually, or emotionally, or even physically passive necessarily (though they might disintegrate enough that they are); what I mean is that they do not actively participate in the war as warriors, they try to continue a child's life in spite of war to the degree that this is possible. To the degree that this is possible. In fact, their experience either **calls to question** or **destroys** the illusion of safety which children need to develop:

- if war calls to question the illusion of safety, the bonds of caretaking are stretched and childhood is threatened. Children are vulnerable psychologically if they do not know that they are safe, if they do not know if they will be taken care of, if they do not know if they can be taken care of.

- if war destroys the illusion of safety, the bonds of caregiving are destroyed, childhood is destroyed. Survival becomes the issue. There is no space for developing an unbruised, undamaged, undefeated sense of self. The actual self, not only the psychological self, is threatened.

2) When children become active/warrior victims (through active participation as warriors in the war effort) the illusion of safety is also destroyed, childhood is destroyed; survival becomes

the issue, there is no space for developing an unbruised, undamaged, undefeated, unselfdefeating sense of self. But something else happens here: the "child" behaves like an adult warrior, trying to fabricate the only power he/she has known, but without having an adult self. These "adultlike" children have only a limited death concept, a limited sense of the risks of their actions, and often a lack of fear. They no longer rely on adults to provide safety. Instead they wrap around themselves a magical cloak of safety which will, in fact, withstand no danger but which establishes the illusion of safety.

On a recent television program in the United States (WLIW/New York), "Moyers: Gathering of Men", Bill Moyers interviewed the American poet, Robert Bly, on, among other things, the subject of warriors. Bly's concept of the positive and negative warrior sheds some light on the child warrior, I think, and, more importantly on the issue of bonding.

Bly talked about the negative warrior, the kind who goes off to kill; but he talked also about the need for a positive warrior: inside of each of us, an inner warrior or "soul warrior" who energizes us and lets us keep with a task until it's finished. The positive warrior "holds the boundaries" of our behavior, keeps us focused. To get a positive warrior, Bly thought, a person must bond with mother and then separate from her psychologically (sound child development theory), then bond with father and separate from him psychologically, then bond with a mentor and, I suppose, eventually separate from him/her. A mentor is a person older than

you, a "heartlink to the world", he/she holds a child in his/her heart and establishes a trusting relationship; if a male, Bly calls him a "male mother". Each of these bonding experiences is necessary.

War, I think, interrupts, perhaps irrevocably, this bonding process at some point: with mother, with father, with mentor, perhaps at all points; leaving a child without psychological and/or physical support or hope. War can also confuse children on the mentor issue at a time when a child may be experiencing diminished or vanquished parental support, at a time when a child is most vulnerable. War can introduce false mentors, negative warriors who go off and kill, but who are attractive in the excitement and power and hope that they engender. These false mentors seduce potential good warriors into becoming bad warriors, into joining the war. But they are not supportive in reality, they don't hold a child in their heart, they don't become a heartlink to the world. They expect obedience and service from very young warriors; they punish in some way.

There are some who might think that these child warrior victims, because they are active and their very activity might reduce feelings of hopelessness, are healthier than those children to whom I have referred as passive victims. I am not sure about this. I suspect that they are in more danger psychologically speaking: they are victims in all the same ways as are the more passive children with the added vulnerability of seeing the world lose control and joining the fray, their own loss of control being

sanctioned by society. They are also in the position of being used and manipulated by adults, not protected by them.

I have also wondered whether it is possible for any children who experience war directly not to be victimized. Can a child come through war unscathed, relatively unscathed? To approach an answer to this question I considered what children are likely to experience living directly in war. I think my list is not exhaustive, but begins like this:

loss of freedom to move about (a Kuwaiti girl interviewed on CNN said, "I used to be able to go about wherever I wanted");

loss of services (schools may close, sanitation/health services become dysfunctional, entertainment services cease);

loss/reduction of available food and supplies in general;

separation/loss of family members
through death, displacement/evacuation, imprisonment;

intensity of sound bombardment (bombs, sirens, warnings, yelling);

disruption of sleep; movement back and forth to shelters;

devastating human and animal sights (maimed and dead people including friends and family members);

torture of others as it is occurring;

torture or taunting of self by peers or adults;

devastating physical sights (bombed buildings, streets, trees destroyed for fuel);

loss of home and/or possessions;

parental/caretaker irritability, fear, panic, hopelessness;

pressure or seduction to become a warrior.

How victimized a child becomes depends, of course, on many variables: which of these experiences a child has had, how many a child has had at one time or in succession; the child's perception of the experience/s which has to do with the child's vulnerability as a person; and the kind of support the child has had, primarily from a family that remains at least partially intact, and from outside mediators (friends, teachers, counselors, other mentors).

Once there is war, once children experience war directly, we cannot protect them really. War may serve political interests, it may serve business interests, it may be a competitive game, it may be described like a fairy tale with a villain, a victim, a hero; it may even serve to act out, as one film described, "menstrual envy" (Zedd, 1990). But it is never good for children.

The literature on children who have experienced war directly describes both kinds of child victim: passive and active/warrior. Professional literature tends to emphasize the child as passive victim; the popular literature tends to emphasize the child as active/warrior victim. I am using the term "war" to refer to violence or force between organized bodies or sides whether or not officially declared.

Children as Passive Victims

I will focus, first, today on children as passive victims and on two possible ways of being victimized:

1) that the emotional reaction of the adult caregiver to the war and its specific events can have a negative affect on the

emotional reaction of the child;

2) that children are more devastated by separation from parents than by the destruction of war.

Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham: A Little Background

I mentioned that I will cite primarily one work. It is a book entitled WAR AND CHILDREN published in 1943 by Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham and based on their work with children and their families at the Hampstead War Nursery (1941) which they co-founded in London, England. Their writing about children and war, based as it is on a psychoanalytic understanding of children, remains the most valuable insight available on the topic even fifty years later. It grew, not only out of their professional relationship but also from their personal relationship which also lasted for about fifty years.

Anna Freud, an Austrian, was the youngest and favorite daughter of Sigmund Freud, psychoanalyzed and trained as a psychoanalyst by her father who remained, as long as he lived, the primary focus of her life. Anna was almost thirty when she met Dorothy Burlingham who was the daughter of another famous man, Louis Tiffany, the New York interior decorator and glass designer. Dorothy, who married a surgeon who experienced severe bouts of manic depression, and who was never cured (and eventually committed suicide) brought her four children to Vienna (1925) to seek psychological help, first for her asthmatic oldest son, and then for each of her children because of the effects of their father's illness and subsequent hospitalizations. Anna became their

psychoanalyst and became drawn, not only to the children; wanting to cure them "but also, at the same time, to have them, or at least something of them, for myself" (Young-Bruehl, 1988, p. 132) but to their mother as well. Anna's attachment to the Burlinghams and the possible blurring of professional lines caused her some conflict early on, but she proceeded to find them lodging in the Freud building and eventually to buy a country home with Dorothy becoming not only analyst, but something of a stepparent to the Burlingham children, a dual role which must have been somewhat problematic thereafter for her and for them (p. 139).

Anna and Dorothy opened a nursery together in Vienna (1937) which evidenced the seeds of their thinking about young children's needs later to been seen and more fully developed in England. The purpose of the nursery was to observe children's actual experiences in the first years of life, not to experiment; toddlers were chosen from amongst Vienna's poorest families, Montessori materials were used, an attempt to include handicapped children was begun but the nursery had run out of time. By 1938 Anna was collected to be interviewed by the Gestapo, and was released despite being a Jew, but Sigmund declared that they must all leave Vienna (p. 227) a complicated process involving entry and work visas for England, exit and tax clearances from Austria. The nursery furniture and materials were sent to London and eventually furnished the Hampstead War Nursery and are reportedly still in use today. Dorothy returned to the United States to check on her, now older, children, was delayed for six months due to restrictions on wartime

travel, but her personal and professional commitment to life in England with Anna was never seriously in doubt (pp. 245-246). She was able to raise money (American Foster Parents became the chief funding agency for the Hampstead War Nursery).

In all, three residences for children whose family lives had become disrupted during the war were set up (two in London, one a farm in Essex) and after the war these became the famous Hampstead Child Therapy Clinic for the treatment of children and for research in child psychoanalysis. WAR AND CHILDREN describes the effects of war on the children of London during the Blitz (bombing of London) but remains relevant to the effects of war on children in other places, other times.

Freud's and Burlingham's study indicates that children find separation from parents more disturbing than the sight of military destruction, injury, and death. Their study excluded children who had received severe bodily injuries in air raids but did not exclude children who had been bombed repeatedly and partially buried in debris.

> ...there were no signs of traumatic shock to be observed in these children. If these bombing incidents occur when small children are in the care of their own mothers or a familiar mother substitute, they do not seem to be particularly affected by them. Their experience remains an accident, in line with other accidents of childhood (p. 21).

They also found that even when children arrived at shelters in the middle of the night, straight from their bombed houses, they showed "little or no excitement and no undue disturbance. They slept and ate normally and played with whatever toys they had rescued or

which might be provided" (p. 21).

When parents showed lack of fear and excitement (p. 34), offered protection and fortification (p. 33) children did not develop air raid anxiety even in cases where the air raid shelter itself was destroyed, the exits blocked, and survivors dragged out by rescuers one by one. A mother described this experience for her child when she appeared with the child at a London clinic: When asked what was the matter with the child she first responded, "I think she has a cough and a bit of a cold". When asked about the cause of these symptoms she responded, "Being taken out from the warmth into the cold might be responsible". When further questioned she explained about the direct hit on the air raid shelter adding, "As a matter of fact, I have been quite worried about the little one because for a while they could not find her", but the transition from the blazing furnace of the shelter to the cold December air resulted in "the cough and a bit of a cold" (p. 33). Another mother described her windows and frames being blasted out. "...we were ever so lucky. We had only blast, and my husband fixed the window frames again" (p. 34). Freud and Burlingham describe "the quiet manner in which the London population on the whole met the air raids...responsible in one way for the extremely rare occurrence of 'shocked' children" (p. 33).

Not all mothers, of course, were so calm. Freud and Burlingham also describe very anxious mothers with very anxious children. One mother developed agoraphobia during air raids. She would not sleep during an alarm and not go to a shelter. She would

stand at the door trembling, insist that her five year old get dressed and stand next to her, holding her hand. He developed nervousness and bedwetting in her company but displayed neither when separated from her in the Children's Centre (p. 34).

While shocked children were rare in London, Freud and Burlingham caution, "It is a widely different matter when children, during an experience of this kind, are separated from or even lose their parents" (p. 21). They write that the fear of air raids takes on completely different dimensions for children who have lost their fathers as a result of bombing.

> In quiet times they turn away from their memories as much as possible and are gay and unconcerned in their play with the other children...The recurrence of an air raid forces them to remember and repeat their former experience...For these children every bomb that falls is like the one which killed the father, and is feared as such (p. 36).

This kind of air raid anxiety is not the usual kind, but primarily a reaction to the death of the father.

Freud and Burlingham summarize types of air raid anxiety in children which have proven relevant far beyond WWII:

1) being mildly interested and afraid, then forgetting the menace and going on with play; they get rid of their fear by dropping their contact with reality and denying the facts, returning to the pursuits and interests of their childish world (pp. 27-28);

2) having fear aroused when killing and destruction are witnessed because their own "bad" destructive and aggressive

impulses are only recently and tentatively buried inside and may be awakened even though they would like to believe they have no further wish to do these things (p. 28);

3) having fear aroused because they are developing conscience, may think that they have done "bad" things, and imagine ghosts, bogeymen, policemen, gypsies, robbers, devils, even the moon which will steal them away. War and its accoutrements can easily be added to this list of fearful punishers of evil thoughts and behavior, they might take children away or their protectors (pp. 30-31);

4) having fear aroused, not only belonging to their own developmental stage, but because they borrow the fear reactions of those grownups around them especially their mothers. The younger the child, the more thoroughly this anxiety will overtake him/her;

5) having fear aroused because of the actual loss of a parent.

These fears were those of children on the whole who remained with at least one parent in London. In addition to focusing on children's reactions to air raids while with their family, Freud and Burlingham studied the effects of evacuation or "billeting" of children in other parts of England and even the United States. This evacuation usually meant separation from parents for long periods of time.

> The war acquires comparatively little significance for children so long as it only threatens their lives, disturbs their material comfort or cuts food rations. It becomes enormously significant the moment it breaks up family life and uproots the first emotional attachments of the child within the family group. London children,

> therefore, were on the whole much less upset by bombing than by evacuation to the country as a protection against it (p. 37).

There was debate about evacuation during the first year of the war, but interest in its psychological repercussions diminished as air raids increased during the second year. Survival took precedence over psychological well-being. Not an unusual happening for the time or for recent times, by the way. Even UNICEF has only recently recognized officially that psychological well-being must go hand-in-hand with survival issues.

Evacuation raised interesting social problems: children billeted with families of higher or lower social and financial status were very conscious of the difference and often resented different value systems (i.e., related to cleanliness, speech, manners, social behavior, moral ideals) seeing them as directed against their own families. Some children refused to wear new clothes either clinging to memories or seeing the change as disloyalty. Some children reacted in the opposite way: dropping their families standards as an expression of hostility to their own parents. Children staying with families of lower socioeconomic status sometimes saw this as punishment for former ungratefulness at home. Often billeting touched on peacetime fantasies of going to a more ideal family or being stolen away from their own family. These fantasies are attempts to deal with conflicted feelings toward their own families; when evacuation occurs in the midst of these normal fantasies it gives "sudden and undesired reality to a situation which was meant to be lived out in the realms of

phantasy" (p. 39).

There were other problems with billeting: foster mothers were expected to care for children whom their neither loved nor "over-estimated" (over-estimation leading to a natural mother's ability to love a child who is neither good-looking nor clever). Foster mothers either remained indifferent to the children billeted with them or adopted the mother's attitude, feeling toward the strange child as if it were her own. There are problems with both stances: with the first the child may be and feel uncared for, may even be abused as sometimes happened (an adult friend in Northern Ireland described to me being billeted from Belfast to the country and being scrubbed painfully over and over again to clean up her naturally olive colored skin, an unusual skin tone for NI); with the second jealousy may arise between the foster and natural mother. The real mother will suddenly turn up on weekends or holidays expecting rights of possession. It was often impossible for two mothers to share one child (pp. 40-41).

There were also problems of jealousy and competition between foster and natural children. Children rarely feel friendly toward new additions to a family; sometimes new additions are gradually accepted if they are small and helpless. Billeted children were neither; they often usurped rights while, at the same time, feeling like second class citizens and being embittered by it (p. 41).

Evacuation schemes were never meant to include children under school age, but often little ones were taken along as younger brothers or sisters. For children under five, mothers were

intended to go along and be billeted also, but mothers were sometimes unwilling or unable to leave London, so little ones went unattended. Children were reported sitting in the exact spot where mother had left them, not speaking, eating, or playing; having long, drawn-out cases of homesickness, upset and despair (p. 43), refusing to be handled or comforted by strangers, monotonously calling their mother, clinging to a toy or article of clothing from home (p. 51), illness (colds, sore throats, intestinal troubles) (p. 53) Often the depth and seriousness of the young child's grief was underestimated, particularly if it was short-lived, because it is not understood that a young child must turn toward a love object to give it immediate satisfaction. Its needs are urgent; it cannot live on memories or look to the future (p. 52). At first unwillingly, but sooner or later the child will turn away from the mother image in its mind and accept another.

Once another is accepted, other problems arise: children sometimes failed to recognize their mothers once they had settled down in their new surroundings. This was not a problem of memory' they would look into their mother's face with stony indifference as if she were a complete stranger, while remembering lifeless objects which were part of their past (p. 53). Parting with fathers was less of a shock as children were generally used to their coming and going. Parting from the mother touched the child's inner relationship with her.

> The mother has disappointed the child and left her unsatisfied; so it turns against her with resentment and rejects the memory of her person from its consciousness (p. 54).

Toward the age of five increased understanding of real situations, of real reasons for being sent away, acts as a real help in lessening the shock. "More comfort can be derived from memories, and hopes for the future begin to play a part" (p. 55). Relationships with parents are less simple and harmonious; a child has ceased to live in partnership with its mother only. It has become a member of a larger family group. Anger and jealousy and resentment are felt toward parents as demands to be more civilized increase...accompanied by strong feelings of guilt. Wishes to banish parents are not uncommon; wishing a parent dead can shift quickly to feeling affectionate. Negative feelings are held in check with parental daily contact. "But separation seems to be an intolerable confirmation of all these negative feelings. Father and mother are now really gone. The child is frightened by their absence and suspects that their desertion may be another punishment or even the consequence of its own bad wishes" (p. 58) To overcome their guilt feelings, children over-stress their love for parents, turning the separation into intense longing which is hard to bear (p. 59).

After age three children rarely forget their parents, but their parental images undergo great changes: absent parents become bigger, better, richer, more generous and tolerant than they ever were in reality; negative feelings are repressed (p. 61). But even though relationship with parents persists in fantasy, the affection of older children gradually leaves the parents. They, too, live mainly in the present, form new ties, become attached to new places

which they are sometimes reluctant to leave (p. 63).

There were many reasons why evacuation seemed a good idea: greater danger to lesser danger, unhygienic conditions for hygienic ones, lessened possibility of infection from people being massed together in shelters, better food, more time for play and companionship, less dreariness and queuing up (p. 44). But all these advantages "dwindle to nothing when weighed against the fact that it has to leave its family to gain them" (p. 45) even when the mothers were not good mothers, even when mother was lazy, negligent, hard and embittered, overly strict. "The attachment of the small child to its mother seems to a large degree independent of her personal qualities, and certainly of her educational ability" (p. 45)

The Hampstead War Nursery, planned initially as a shelter for bombed-out shelter shifted to fill a greater need for a residence designed particularly for children who were billeting problems in some way: they couldn't be evacuated without their mothers or, perhaps, developed difficulties in foster care situations. At three sites all working at capacity in 1941, 120 children were being cared for (pp. 246-247). In addition to the long-range impact of this nursery, an impact was felt as Freud and Burlingham drew on their understanding of children and families to plan their environment: they made a point of involving absent parents as much as possible in the children's lives. Mothers of newborns were encouraged to live in and work as housekeepers so that they could nurse their babies; a number of sibling groups were accepted

together so that sibling bonds would not, like so much else, be disrupted and so that parents would be visiting only one place. The buildings were open to visiting at all hours. Correspondence was maintained with fathers serving overseas; cards, letters, and packages were requested and received for children when parents could not visit (pp. 249-250). The nursery became a training during the war for teachers and psychoanalysts during the war and remains one of the most famous centers for the psychoanalytic study of children today.

Other researchers of children and war during WWII and after partially support the findings of Freud and Burlingham related to children as passive victims of war yet differ in some ways as well.

Enid John (University College, London, 1941) studied 100 children evacuated from London and billeted in a Welsh seaside resort during WWII. She found that unsatisfactory adjustment was greater among pre-school children than among older school-age children. "...this is not essentially due to the greater susceptibility of children at these tenderer years, but rather to the less satisfactory arrangements made for the billeting of these cases" (p. 179). She found that children under two adjusted themselves somewhat better than children between two and five and than, among pre-school children, the less intelligent children adjusted somewhat better than the brighter children. In addition, she found that children of stable temperament adjusted better than children of "an unstable temperament" and that the emotional characteristics of child and mother were more important to

adjustment than the non-psychological conditions of the billet itself. She found that children billeted with their own siblings or with their own mother adjusted more readily than those without siblings and mother and that, if siblings and mother were not present it helped to have other young children in the billet home. Children moved among a succession of billet homes were found to be unsatisfactorily adjusted. Even after three to six months in a quiet area, children who had experienced air raids were found to show nervous after-affects, particularly those children whose mothers had exhibited fear when in the child's vicinity (pp. 180-181). Unique in the John study, I think, was that it was not the youngest children who suffered most but those closer to school age (due to their increased awareness of change John believed) and that the nature of the billet homes (proper food, warmth, fresh air, hygienic conditions in general as well as security, affection, sympathy; qualified caretakers, caretakers who like to care for the age child she's given) appeared mainly responsible for poor adjustment rather than the nature of the small child itself (p. 175).

The popular literature on children and war describes evacuation of young British children (between the ages of five and sixteen) sent far beyond the British countryside to Canada, Australia, and the United States. The most disastrous effect of this kind of evacuation was the sinking of the ship CITY OF BENARES by a U-boat as it headed for Canada. Seventy-three evacuees were killed, bringing to an end the "Children's Overseas Reception Board

(CORB) (Wicks, 1989). There were, however, other negative effects of the overseas evacuation: Children were sent early in the war and then became stranded, with no possible visitation by parents, for five years. Many of these children were now securely attached to foster families and felt no wish to return home to families they no longer knew.

Evacuation was not unique to England during WWII, though perhaps more children were evacuated from cities in England, and from England itself than from any other country (3,500,000). To protect the children of Finland, strategically important to Northern Europe, many children were evacuated to Sweden which remained neutral throughout the war (Williams, 1989); this evacuation, and others throughout Europe necessitated learning a second language.

Ernst Papanek was responsible in 1939 for buying up castles in Southern France (under the auspices of the OSE, an organization of Russian and Polish doctors) for setting up and directing in them shelters for European refugee children. Their goal was to save as many children as possible. The children were largely the children of political or Jewish refugees located elsewhere in France, others were children smuggled of Nazi occupied countries. Still other children were sent walking to France by panic stricken Jewish parents as a last hope for survival. Papanek was an educator and child psychologist, fugitive from Austria himself, who would later come to the United States and found the Wiltwick School for Boys in the Bronx and, later, upstate New York. Papanek wanted to send

back the kind of healthy, unbroken child that the parent, dead or alive, would have wanted; his goal was not only the physical survival of children.

Papanek's fascinating story is told in his book OUT OF THE FIRE (1975). Of particular interest is his description of children's reactions to the war as they experienced it in France, children who were separated from parents in a residential school setting. He reports that the older children had already read enough books and seen enough movies to be able to picture bombs falling and to imagine the resulting death and destruction. They were convinced that every action of the enemy was aimed at them.

> Oh, intellectually, they were perfectly aware that Hitler's grand design for the conquest of France was not really dependent upon the destruction of a handful of children's institutions, even if 80-90% of the children were Jews. What can the mind tell you, though, when the feeling in your bones tells you otherwise? When they read about gas bombs they were sure we would be the first targets. When they read about bacteriological warfare they were sure our water would be the first to be poisoned (p. 20).

The least frightened at all times, Papanek indicates, were the preschoolers and kindergarten children. His explanation of this is that at this age "children are feeling creatures rather than thinking ones. Neither a blackout nor the wail of sirens holds any terror for them unless they have been personally injured in an air raid or have seen someone injured close by. They fear blackouts only if they are already afraid of the dark. They fear bombs and guns only if at some previous time they have been made to fear

noise" (p. 21). Air raid drills were a game to them. They were sometimes cranky at being awakened or so tired that they would drop to a step and fall asleep. Once in the basement it was only a matter of tucking them in for them to fall asleep again (p. 21).

> Children of that age perceive the threat to them only by the reactions of the trusted people around them, their parents and teachers, their older sisters and brothers, and their comrades. Since we are careful not to alarm them, they literally sleep through every alert (p. 21).

Papanek saw the most vulnerable children as those between the ages of eight and twelve, "because this is the age of intellectual transition".

> They were old enough to understand the dangerous situation they were in and young enough to be only too conscious of their own limitations. But this was one instance...where the cure could be found in the malady. Their fear and confusion arose out of their developing intellect, and we were able to help them to overcome both the fear and confusion by intellectual persuasion. With them, even more than with the others, it was necessary to explain things completely and never to underestimate their ability to understand what we were saying---even...when they did not seem to understand. They'll understand when they're ready. They may want a little time to think about it, that's all (p. 21).

Papanek refers to the magical thinking of these children, a magic power which can be turned into a cloak or magic carpet: the wish is as good as the deed. While sitting through a particularly long air raid they began singing the "Marseillaise" over and over. As Pananek tried to finally call it quits, the children insisted on singing it one more time: "When our fliers

hear us they will be inspired to do their best. When the Nazis hear us they'll know that we are not afraid and they will fly back and worry" (p. 22). For even the older children Papanek refers to the importance of adults concealing their own fear. "For just as long as the adults were able to conceal their fear, the children of all ages behaved with courage and spirit". On one occasion when a woman teacher in the girl's home became hysterical, all of the girls began crying, many clinging to each other, trembling and shaking. Others were standing alone screaming at the top of their lungs.

Papanek also wrote that the children often did not know what they were afraid of: not of dying, "they couldn't imagine anything as concrete as their own death. They were afraid of 'it'. Just 'it'. A free-floating fear they could give to name or shape to" (p. 23). In a discussion on fear, Papanek told the children that with so much fear danger around "we had no time for imaginary dangers. We fear war, yes; we hate it. But we fear more the dangers and destruction and the loss of freedom with which our enemies threaten us." They then described specifics: antiaircraft, how bombs work and Pananek added that fear wasn't going to help anyone escape these dangers. "Fear had never been know to alter the course of a single bomb or drive off a single enemy plane. As best, fear accomplished nothing; at worst, it prevented you from acting constructively to protect yourself" (p. 24).

Another issue involving children often separated from parents

during WWII, is that of what have been called "hidden children", Jewish children (perhaps 10,000 in number) hidden in convents or Christian homes often for the duration of the war. Professional and popular literature refers to these children; the problems set in motion by their particular war experience are unique. A recent article in NEW YORK (Marks, 1991) describes their experience: they lost everything children need to feel safe and whole; each day brought risk of seizure, separation from families, death. "They faced terror, a sense of guilt simply because they were alive, and the shame inherent in having to conceal who they really were---to keep quiet and out of sight, on pain of death" (p. 39). Some were hidden in haylofts or sewers, scavenging for food on nights with no moon, forced never to talk above a whisper, always cold, scared of shadows, never seeing daylight.

Did the children placed in convents or with families fare better? Convent hidden children describe feeling different, being rejected. If the convent was a Catholic orphanage these children were different not only by religion but because they had a parent/s somewhere. One child described not wanting his mother to come on her weekly visit because the other children would taunt him for being different, for having a parent. Home hidden children often became attached to a new family and experiencing rich childhoods, well cared for and protected. For them the hell began after the war, either in being hidden from their biological family's survivors, being forced to convert (Isser, 1984), or being kidnapped by Jewish organizations which may have had idealistic

intentions, but which created chaos in young children's lives, children who now had to deal with a second traumatic separation (Marks, 1991, p. 44). Some of these children became ashamed of their Jewishness and rejected Jewish life and religion. The Christian experience became associated with protection and selflessness; Judaism became associated with ostracism, self-deprecation, and selfishness. Later efforts to reconnect with their Jewish roots and to develop an identity which included their contradictory experience were often painful and difficult (Hogman, 1988).

While the focus of many WWII studies has been primarily on the short-term effects of evacuation or separation from parents, some studies undertaken after WWII focused on long-term effects, particularly of children who survived concentration camps. These studies report unresolved mourning, unending rage, insecurity and inability to trust fellow countrymen not to repeat the horrors of the past (Baum, 1989); the adoption of the role of either "victimized Jew" or "fighter" (Danieli, 1982); the development of "Concentration Camp Syndrome" characterized by delayed effect symptoms resulting from prolonged traumatization: anxiety, depression, restlessness, sleep disorders, recurring nightmares or persecution and difficulties in establishing meaningful relationships (Kurtz, 1989). Another study indicates that the losses and disabilities associated with aging interact with unhealed psychic wounds and chronic health problems from the concentration camp experience bringing the effects of the war to

the surface for the first time in many years, indicating that coping strategies used and depended on since the war are particularly vulnerable during the aging process (Steinitz, 1982).

There is also a great deal of literature indicating that the effects of concentration camp internment seeps into the next generation/s: feelings of guilt, difficulty in externalizing aggressive impulses in reaction to frustrating events (Nadler, Kay, & Gleitman, 1985), difficulty in dealing with a "conspiracy of silence", when concentration camp survivors cannot talk about their experience (Danieli, 1982). Some studies, however, indicate little difference between survivors and control groups in terms parenting skills indicating that cultural factors and their own developmental history may have more of an impact on parenting than concentration camp experience (Leon, 1981; Zlotogorski, 1983).

Another research study compares the long-range effects of evacuation on Finnish children, between one and thirteen years at the time of the evacuation (Rasanen, 1989) to Finnish children who stayed with their families. As adults it was found that the evacuees had received less education and had lower professional status than their peers who had stayed with their own family. Psychiatric disturbances, however, were equal; evacuees were physically healthier.

Mass (1963; Yarrow, 1983) studied young adults twenty years after they had been separated from their parents and placed in a residential nursery during WWII. His subjects (20 cases) had been separated once and reunited after a long period of time. The

findings suggest that this kind of separation does not necessarily result in severe personality disturbance in later life; a single traumatic experience is probably not in itself a sufficient condition for later personality distortion. It does, however, increase the likelihood of personality damage if there are later reinforcing life experiences. Mass suggests that there may be a capacity for recovery and a greater toughness and resiliency in people than clinicians are inclined to assume. Mass does differentiate, however, between age at the time of separation: children separated younger than one year evidence the highest incidence of personal-social disturbance twenty years later, not because a focused relationship with the mother has been interrupted, but because it is not now able to grow. Infants were deprived of the learning conditions necessary for the development of significant interpersonal relationships (pp. 74-75).

Heinicke and Westheimer (1965) who studied children separated from parents in a residential nursery suggest that the quality of the separation should be evaluated in determining the effects of this kind of separation:

1) the nature of the child's previous development and relationship to parents;

2) the circumstances of the separation (gradual or abrupt; quality of the setting and staff);

3) the age and developmental status of the child;

4) the length of the separation and expectation of return to the parents;

5) the amount of contact that can be maintained with the family as well as the accompaniment of siblings;

6) the potential for forming substitute relationships in the new environment (p. 2).

Morris Fraser in his book CHILDREN IN CONFLICT, GROWING UP IN NORTHERN IRELAND (1973) writes that there is a certain universality about a child's response to disaster. The varying realities of the event may well add details to the nightmare and fantasy, but the child's fear is always...that of loss of the factors that make for physical and emotional security. He dreads the prospect of separation from his parents as much, if not more, than he does bodily harm to himself...an aspect of preventive psychiatry often forgotten in the rush to evacuate children from disaster areas.

Fraser refers to children's reactions to what he calls "riot stress" in Belfast. He writes that their reaction depends partially on the degree of emotional security enjoyed by the child before and during the period of acute stress. "This related not only to his (the child's) own psychological resources, but also to those of his immediate family" (p. 74). Children who were vulnerable and whose parents were vulnerable before and during the period of stress were more vulnerable to the stress. Vulnerable children showed prior nervous symptoms, were not physically robust, and had over-reactive parents (a mother might become acutely agitated, a father might become angry and aggressive during a riot in the street. These children would see their parents as

vulnerable, feel inhibited from expressing their own anxiety, their anxiety would then communicate itself as a psychiatric symptom. "No child was disturbed in isolation; each problem, on examination, proved to be that of a disturbed family. The parents' inadequacy when it came to providing emotional support had been evident long before the period of acute stress; then it had broken down completely...one child said, 'My parents were calm, so I didn't worry. If they had been frightened, it would have been awful.'" (p. 75). Fraser writes that it was as if each child had his Achilles heel (fainting fits, somatic symptoms) which showed up when the immediate family failed to respond adequately to his needs during a period of acute stress (p. 75).

Fraser indicates that it is probably children between eight and puberty who were most vulnerable, probably related to increased comprehension. Younger children did not fully understand the danger, could more easily be reassured. "On the other hand, older children were more likely to find refuge in action or flight, and were less susceptible to wild rumor" (p. 76).

Children as Active/Warrior Victims

Strands apparent in the literature focusing on children as active/warrior victims are the following:

1) that acting as child warrior interrupts healthy development and may cause irreparable damage;

2) that acting as child warrior is generally sanctioned in the societies where it occurs;

3) that there must be a battle for children to begin acting

as warriors;

4) that children are often not naive in their political thinking about war and their role as warrior.

Freud and Burlingham's WAR AND CHILDREN (1943) is the best source for a psychological explanation of the child warrior. They write that it is a common misunderstanding that children are saddened by destruction and aggression. Children between one and two years when put together in a playpen will bite each other,pull hair, steal toys without regard for the each other's happiness. At their stage of development, destruction and aggression play leading roles (p. 22).

When young children are observed at play, they are seen to destroy toys, pull of the legs and arms of dolls or soldiers, puncture balls, smash whatever is breakable. We often say that there is continual war raging in the nursery. "...destructive and aggressive impulses are still at work in children in a manner in which they only occur in grown-up life when they are let loose for the purposes of war (p. 22).

It is a recognized aim of education to deal with aggressiveness in children, to change the child's own attitude toward these impulses. The wish to hurt people and objects undergo changes: they are usually restricted, then suppressed by commands, then repressed, which means that they disappear from the child's consciousness. The child does not dare any more to have knowledge of these wishes; there is always danger, however, that they might return (p. 23).

When war occurs in a child's life, the child doesn't turn away from the destruction in instinctive horror, "as people seem to expect, the child may turn toward (it) with primitive excitement" (p. 23). The real danger is not that the child will be shocked into stillness but that "the destructiveness raging in the outer world may meet the very real aggressiveness which rages in the inside of the child" (p. 24). They continue, "At the age when education should start to deal with these impulses confirmation should not be given from the outside world that the same impulses are uppermost in other people" (p. 24). They cite children playing joyfully on bombed sites, with blasted bits of furniture; they'll throw bricks at each other. "It becomes impossible to educate them towards a repression of, a reaction against destruction while they are doing so" (p. 24). Children fight against their own wishes to kill those who disturb, disappoint, or offend them in some way; it is very difficult for them to accomplish this task then people are hurt and killed every day around them. "Children have to be safeguarded against the primitive horrors of...war, not because horrors and atrocities are so strange to them, but because we want them at this decisive stage of their development to overcome and estrange themselves from the primitive and atrocious wishes of their own infantile nature" (p. 24). When children are not able to repress aggression, or when they return to earlier modes of expression for aggressive tendencies, their destructive tendencies will turn equally toward living people and toward lifeless objects (p. 78) and healthy development will be interrupted.

Children generally did not fight during WWII. More frequently, perhaps, children were used in resistance movements in Poland (children as young as eight or nine) France, and Belgium (Audry Hepburn reports carrying messages on her way to and from school) and in The Hitler Youth Movement in Germany. The latter was a children's army, complete with its own uniform and drill; members were thought to be unquestioning disciples of Hitler's basic beliefs, often asked to spy or report subversive information about their own family. As the war went on, children as young as thirteen were reportedly conscripted into the German army. One child wrote, "I remember my time in the army as one of the best of my life, It was a great adventure and very exciting. When you're young you don't think about the hardships" (Williams, 1989).

The June, 1990, issue of TIME focused on child warriors in four countries: Afghanistan, Burma, Northern Ireland, and the United States (Los Angeles). Roger Rosenblatt, an American journalist, wrote CHILDREN OF WAR (1983) focusing on Northern Ireland as well, but added Isreal, Palestine, Greece, Cambodia, and Viet Nam. It would seem that, as the implementation of war has changed over the fifty years since the beginning of WWII, children have become more vital to the war effort in many countries.

The terrible irony of child warriors is that their efforts often make little difference to the outcome of a battle, but their participation "crystallizes all that is terrible about war" (Stanley, 1990). The United Nations estimates that about 200,000 children under the age of fifteen are bearing arms around the

world. The Salvadoran army conscripts boys under age eighteen; the Ethiopian army accepts boys as young as 13; but most child warriors belong to rebel armies. Where and how much they fight depends on how desperately their services are needed: in Afghanistan nine year olds are used by rebels; in Burma, twelve year olds; a Salvadoran rebel group includes girls alongside of boys (Stanley (p. 32) Sometimes children are coerced, sometimes they volunteer. Children are often ready, even eager to bear arms. Why? Reasons often cited include the following:

- boys have a primitive urge to fight
- children have a deep-rooted desire to please their elders
- battle is exciting
- children have a limited understanding of death
- children are unable to anticipate all the risks of their actions
- death might be seen as culturally an honor and guarantee of eternal life
- everyone else is doing it; the wish to belong is powerful
- children see war as a game
- war is a quick trip into adulthood
- military and paramilitary groups teach warriorism

A thirteen year old Afgan boy says, "I was happy because I killed them" when asked about killing. This child has participated in seven battles and has been fighting since he was ten. In the most recent he killed at close range. He thumped the bodies with his rifle but to make sure they were dead and calmly removed a

revolver from one corpse. This is a holy war; fathers take sons to war with them. Mothers who demur are ignored. Boys are not coerced here, they are happy to go to war. All boys, however, are urged to fight. Death is an honor, the Muslim's guarantee of eternal life, but, for the children it is also a game. "It is a game to them", an Afghan rebel says, "They want to play as being soldiers" (p. 33) The children deny this, "We came here to fight. We don't want to play" (p. 34). The curriculum of some schools are molded by war with well-practiced chants: "I will not let the foreigner's foot into my country/Either I will be martyred or I will kill him" and recess drill. When injured, briefly childhood returns, and a child warrior, injured by a land mine, calls for his mother (p. 35).

In Burma Karen rebels have been fighting for independence for 42 years; combat is family business (p. 33). The 5,000 person Karen army has been waging war against Rangoon to establish an independent state in the southern part of the country. Karens are a well-ordered, predictable ethnic group. They log, farm, attend church and send their children to school. Their penal code is strict (adultery brings the death penalty)...but their children go to the front line to fight. A fifteen year old is certain he will never be hit by a bomb. He encountered the Burmese enemy for the first time when taken by surprise; he sprayed everything in sight with automatic fire. When asked if he was frightened, he shrugs. Sometimes, when needed children younger than fifteen are allowed to fight. One eleven year old is so tiny his M-16 rifle is

sawed in half so that he can carry it; when he suffers from a bout of malaria there is no one to wipe his brow or take his temperature. He just lies in his bunker until the fever breaks and then goes back to fight. One child, wearing a Mickey Mouse T shirt, is so excitable he must be watched. "When there is shelling, the younger ones forget to take cover. They get too excited. They have to be ordered to get down inside the bunkers" Unlike the Afghans, the Karens have mixed feelings about using children for war; the children, too, seem to have mixed feelings: "I have to do my military service, but I'd rather be farming back home" (p. 49)

Joan Harbison, in a book entitled CHILDREN OF THE TROUBLES, (1983) sets a context for Northern Irish children, in describing the relative normalcy of most children, "their successful educational attainments and their ability to adapt to the unusual features of their environment" (p. 10) probably because of the permanence and strength of the communities in Northern Ireland which provides a stable background behind a very unstable foreground (p. 11), more specifically the strength of the church's influence and the fundamentalist religious values espoused by both Protestants and Catholics, the strong family ties and family support (McWhirter, 1981, p. 389) The "Troubles" of Northern Ireland are complex involving high unemployment particularly in Catholic neighborhoods, poor housing possibilities described as the "worst in Europe" (p. 2-3), neighborhoods and school systems separated by religion. It would be expected that this combination

would provide a fertile breeding ground for ordinary criminal activity but this has not proven so; also terrorist linked offenses account for a small portion of juvenile crime (p. 10).

Some researchers agree. They indicate that there is little evidence to support the view that children living in Northern Ireland are preoccupied with violence (McWhirter & Trew, 1981, p. 311); that the majority of children, in fact, censure violence (McWhirter, 1982, p. 174); that the number of indictable offenses in Northern Ireland is only 2/3 the rate of England and Wales; that sectarian violence constitutes a relatively small proportion of all known offenses in Northern Ireland (McWhirter, 1982, p. 74); that fears of a serious growth of antisocial behavior among the young people of Northern Ireland and the total disintegration of society are largely unjustified (McWhirter, 1981, p. 389).

Maximum publicity is, however, accorded those children in Northern Ireland who seek to obtain revenge as child warriors. Their behavior is often socially approved, openly by companions, tacitly by parents and relatives (Fraser, p. 60). Early in the latest phase of the Troubles (1969-present) sophisticated guerilla techniques were taught to children who graduated with age and experience from message carrying, stone throwing and bin-lid-banging to the calculated use of deadly weapons: petrol bombs, nail bombs, sub-machine guns. Young children were taught to make incendiary devices and to transport them in school bags (which the army began to search in 1972) and strapped to their body. Young children have been seen as ideal for planting bombs and booby-traps

because they attract less suspicion than adults, they are less able to give information about their "employers" if caught, and they can lure army patrols more easily into ambushes (Fraser, pp. 1-10; p. 41). Catholic children grow up throwing stones at police vans and army vehicles and taunting soldiers (Conroy, 1981, p. 18); the children of both "dirty prods" and "filthy Fenians" carry messages, set fires, use guns and knives (Coles, 1980, p. 33). Only part of the children's activity is organized by adults; most juvenile gangs form spontaneously, adopting the uniform and tactics of their elders (Fraser, p. 41). "Children with limited death concepts, unable through immaturity to anticipate all the risks of their actions, have accepted this role without hesitation" (p. 41). The child warrior, born in self-defeat, becomes the hero. Fraser has found that the aggression does not diminish with experience in riots, but increases.

The flow for some children in Northern Ireland moves back and forth between Warrior and hoodlum. "After twenty years of war Belfast has spawned a new generation of terrorists" (McNeil, 1989, p. 24) Children (8, 9, and 10 year olds) steal cars and set them on fire "because there's nothing else to do" (Conroy, 1980; McNeil, 1989). Older children take the cars for nighttime cruises and abandon them at the end of the night; younger children set them on fire, sometimes sitting in the car giggling until it gets too hot. They're not afraid it will explode, "We use petrol here. First the tires go, and then in 15 minutes the engine goes..." (McNeil, p. 26). Both the British and the IRA agree that they have created

little monsters. who have caused the deaths of scores of pedestrians by their reckless driving and destroyed property with their petrol...just like the IRA and the British. "Only these kids (warriors?) follow no ideology nor believe any cause. They are only imitating the big boys around them...these pre-adolescent lunatics have joined the madness for the fun of it. They have grown up addicted to the explosions. And they want more, because there literally isn't anything else to do" (McNeil, pp. 27-28). For the hoods, violence and danger have a special attraction.

They steal cars not for profit, but to relieve their boredom. Sometimes they drive through army checkpoints without stopping; sometimes soldiers, thinking them terrorists, shoot and kill. A parish priest remarked, "I think death and injury is a normal thing; it is not a significant event in their lives" (Conroy, 1981, p. 21); when someone suggested involving joy riders in a stock car racing program, a Catholic bureaucrat responded that he didn't think it would provide enough excitement. "I think you'll have to have someone shooting at them as well" (p. 21). Police give chase but don't dare leave their armored vehicles to give chase on foot; the IRA doesn't care about the stealing of cars but do care about attracting police into Catholic neighborhoods. The IRA kneecap them; elbowcap them...but if death won't stop them why would kneecapping. The Protestant paramilitaries kneecap also but not so often; kneecapping is a private matter among warriors: The IRA kneecap Catholics, the Protestants kneecap Protestants (p. 70). The young warriors of both side look about the same: they sniff

glue, they are truants, they're unemployed; their crimes vary: the Protestant hoods prefer theft primarily; the Catholic hoods prefer stealing cars, hijacking and burning trucks, rioting (p. 71).

"So what are you going to do when you get out of school?" a teenage child was asked in Belfast.

"I don't go to school nye. Left in primary school."

"Got a job?"

"Stealin'."

"So what are you going to do when you get older?"

"Die, I suppose, doesn't seem like much else." (McNeil, p. 77).

Some Northern Irish children are quite sophisticated in their understanding of the Troubles. A nine year old Belfast boy:

> There's no future for us, unless we get our rights. The way it is now, Belfast is run by the Brits, and it's the Prods who own everything. The owners of stores or the factories don't like us because we're Catholic. The union people, they're against us "dirty Fenians" and they say we're pigs and we should go South. We have to use our heads. They're waiting for us to make mistakes. They'd like an excuse to be rid of us (Coles, 1986; Katz, 1988, p. 200).

And a ten year old:

> If only some kids my age, Orangies, could be told the truth (Coles, p. 84)
>
> If we had it fair in Belfast, we could live with them (Coles, p. 85).

And a nine year old Protestant girl whose brother was shot by the IRA:

> Billy (her brother) felt sorry for the Fenians. He said they belong to Jesus too. Billy meant that the Lord creates all of us, and we may fight but we should pray for those we fight with, and if we don't, we're going to be in a lot of trouble when we meet Him (p. 89)

And a seven year old Catholic girl in Derry (called Londonderry by the British):

> Never say Londonderry here in the Bogside. You'll be killed! Everyone will think you're an Orangie. Maybe if you're lucky they'll hear you say a few words, and they'll know you're an American; but if they don't spot your accent, you'll be wiped out...You see that wall over there? It was built in 1648...The English came here. They named the city after their capital. They used to stand on that wall and called us pigs. They said we belonged in pig sties, and we should do their dirty work (Coles, 1986; Katz, 1988, p. 201).

And a 16 year old Protestant girl in Belfast:

> I went home and I thought, 'I'm just really fed up that I have to hate this woman because she's wearing a nun's habit. I have to hate this fellow because he's a Catholic.' It just went over and over in my mind, you know...I'd never met any Catholics, never, never...It's just that where I lived there weren't any (Lederer, 1988).

A PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) colonel, referring to his four year old son remarked to Roger Rosenblatt, "They are so young...but they are so proud." (1983, p. 97). The colonel was asked if he would send his son to war. "I don't want him to suffer. But he would give his blood to regain his homeland. If I am killed, my son will carry my gun" (pp. 97-98). At refugee camps in Lebanon children carry guns, go through military exercises, sing patriotic songs with gusto. These children have become warriors. Is it better than meandering in the poverty of their people? They

have a mission in life, uniforms, weapons to go with them. They have order and hierarchy, they have a sense of importance of being essential to a particular goal and to an abstract idea (p. 99).

Conclusion

It is clear that war experienced directly is dangerous to children's development both psychologically and physically: it is overwhelming to consider the victimization of children over the past fifty years, let alone over the centuries undocumented due to lack of reportage.

It is apparent beyond question that war at best calls to question the illusion of safety which children need to develop, at worst destroys this illusion of safety. It is apparent beyond question that war at best stretches the bonds of caretaking threatening childhood, at worst destroys the bonds of safety, destroying childhood.

It is apparent beyond question that war leaves little or no space for developing an unbruised, undamaged, undefeated sense of self.

And yet...most children show a great capacity for emotional renewal after even nightmarish experiences. It is still not clear whether emotional renewal signifies cure or symptoms disguised or submerged.

There is some indication that PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) affects children years after war: David Kinzie of the Portland Health Sciences University reports that Cambodian children now in the United States are experiencing recurrent nightmares,

difficulty in concentrating and sleeping, being easily startled, showing signs of depression (lack of energy, interest in life, brooding, self-pity, pessimism) and shame at being alive; admitting that they had never told anyone about their feelings (Goleman, 1987).

The long-term effects may be even more grim for those children trained and used as warriors. Neil Boothby, a Duke University psychologist, who has studied and treated Cambodian refugees, reports that children who had done a lot of killing in Cambodia as young as eight years and often into adolescence were psychologically intact as long as they stayed with the Khmer Rouge; when they came to a refugee camp they fell apart (Goleman, 1987).

William Arroyo, a psychiatrist at the University of Southern California who studied South American war refugees in Los Angeles, writes that psychological problems related to war vary with age:
- children under five often regress by returning to bed wetting or loss of toilet training, extreme anxiety about strangers or a parent's leaving, loss of recently mastered skills like speech;
- school-age children often use play or day dreams to deny whast actually happened by rewriting the past with a happier outcome; they may obsessively repeat joyless games that reenact the event;
- adolescents generally misbehave: truancy, promiscuity, drug abuse, delinquency (Goleman, 1987).

How bleak is the view: bleak, bleaker, bleakest? Nina Murray, a clinical psychologist at Harvard, studied children who survived the Holocaust. They were well-adjusted as adults...they

have occasional flashbacks and nightmares, but they are generally stable, productive, compassionate people who are not cynical or pessimistic, but optimistic despite whast they lived through (Goleman, 1987). Certainly testimony for children's capacity for emotional renewal. Perhaps this will be the legacy of the children of Afghanistan, Burma, Northern Ireland, Israel, Palestine, Cambodia, Vietnam, Northern Ireland, Kuwait, Iraq, Sarajevo, Somalia, Rwanda, none of whom could find much safety in a wild place.

The point of understanding the bonding between Freud and Burlingham, the link with their work, and the work itself, and the work of others related to the caretaking of children during war is ultimately that we'll work harder in our public life to prevent wars (an outcome that we are unlikely to achieve, I am afraid, even with hard work) and in our private life to build nurturing values in both males and females. That we'll work harder to maintain the illusion of safety for children (there being to real safety this is the best we can hope for), as Freud and Burlingham did, wherever we can so that they will have time to develop an unbruised, undamaged, undefeated, unselfdefeating sense of self which will lead to their own nurturing ability.

Maurice Sendak, the American children's author and illustrator, illustrated the concept of illusory safety by drawing a bird's nest filled with baby birds atop the head of one of his imaginary wild creatures in THE BIG BOOK FOR PEACE, a picture book for children on peace. He labeled his illustration "A Wild Safe

Place". This, I think, is what Anna Freud and Dorothy Burlingham were after with each other and for children, an illusion of safety in a wild world. This, I think, is the heritage which we, as caregivers of each other and of children, can continue in our public and private life..

REFERENCES

Bly, R. (1990). Iron John. NY: Addison-Wesley.

Carlsson-Paige, N. & Levin, D. E. (1985). Helping children understand peace, war, and the nuclear threat. Washington, DC: National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Durell, A. & Sachs, M., Eds. (1990). The big book for peace. NY: Dutton Children's Books.

Dizdarevic, Z. (1993). Sarajevo/A war journal. NY: Fromm International.

Filipovic, Z. (1994). Zlata's diary. NY: Viking.

Fraser, M. Children in conflict. NY: Basic Books.

Freud, A. & Burlingham, D. (1943). War and children. NY: Ernst Willard.

Goleman, D. (February 24, 1987). "Terror's children: Mending mental wounds", The New York Times.

Harbison, J. (1983). Children of the Troubles. Belfast, NI: Stranmillis College.

Hogman, F. (Winter, 1988). "The experience of Catholicism for Jewish children during World War II", Psychoanalytic Review. 75(4) 511-532.

Isser, N. (Fall, 1984). "The Linneweil affair: A study in adolescent vulnerability", Adolescence. 19(75) 629-642.

Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). Shattered assumptions/Toward a new psychology of trauma. NY: The Free Press.

John, Enid. (1941). "The effects of evacuation and air raids on children of pre-school age".

Lakoff, G. (1991). "Metaphor and War". Unpublished paper.

Leavitt, L. A. & Fox, N. A. (1993). The Psychological effects of war and violence on children. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

McNamee, A. (1982). Introduction. Children & stress. Washington: DC: Association for Childhood Education International.

McNamee, A. & McNamee, J. (1981). "Stressful life experiences in the early childhood educational setting". In C. F. Wells & I. R. Stuart (Eds.). Self-destructive behavior in children and adolescents. NY: Van Nostrand.

McNamee, J. (1994). "Trauma and development". Unpublished paper presented at the New York State Psychological Association spring meeting, Bolton's Landing, NY, May 15, 1994.

Marks, J. (February 25, 1991). "The Hidden Children", New York.

Papanek, E. (1975). Out of the fire. NY: Morrow. (As told to E. Linn).

Rosenblatt, R. (1983). Children of war. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Stanley, A. (June 18, 1990). "Child warriors", TIME.

Wicks, B. (1989). The day they took the children. London: Bloomsbury.

Yarrow, L. J. (February, 1963). "Long-term implications of maternal separation", Child Welfare.

Young-Bruehl, E. (1988). Anna Freud, a biography. NY: Summit Books.